

81. Particular Application System, first stage



Dr. Ruben Garcia Pedraza

[Probabilidad Imposible: Particular Application System, first stage](#)

imposiblenever@gmail.com

81. Particular Application System, first stage

The first stage of the particular [Application System](#), as an outer instructions application sub-system, is the particular database of instructions. In this post, I will develop who will be responsible for filing the particular instructions in the particular database of instructions, how it should be organised, and the role of the first rational supervision in the particular database of instructions, according to who was responsible for filing the instructions in the database. Finally, I will make some general comments about [artificial psychology](#) and awareness, which is going to be really important in the replication of cyborg psychology into artificial psychology.

The responsible for filing the particular instructions in the particular database of instructions, will depend on the level of monitoring in particular programs.

In a partial des-centralized Global Artificial Intelligence, the global Application System instead of working directly with robotic devices, will co-work with particular programs, not having the global outer sub-system direct control of all the robotic devices, the number of robotic devices under management of the global outer sub-system will be limited as long as the particular programs are able to be responsible for many robotic devices as possible.

And within this second option, within the partial des-centralized outer sub-system is important to point out different levels of monitoring of the particular Application System as particular outer sub-system, depending on who is responsible to file the particular instructions in the particular database of instructions as first stage of the third step in the third stage of the fifth phase.

Depending on the level of monitoring of the particular outer sub-system, the responsible for filing the particular instructions in the particular database of instructions is:

- **Low level of monitoring: decisions made by the *particular Modelling System***, once the particular decisions have passed the particular quick rational checks or the particular seven rational adjustments, in the *particular Decisional System*, and according to their nature have been ***informed and/or authorized (passing their respective global quick rational checks or seven global rational adjustments) by the *global Decisional System****, depending on their nature (some of them are only informed, others must be authorised), then in the *third stage of the particular Decisional System*, all particular decision ready to be applied has to be transformed into a range of particular instructions, and later on the particular Decisional System files the particular instructions in the particular database of instructions.

- **lower intermediate level of monitoring: decisions made by the *global Modelling System*** once are authorized by the global Decisional System, if these decisions are **to be fully applied by a particular program**, the global Decisional System sends the decisions to the *particular Decisional System* to pass the particular *assessments* (particular quick checks or rational adjustments, in addition to the global quick check or rational adjustments and the seven rational comparisons in the global Decisional System), transforming these decisions the *particular Decisional System* into particular instructions. Here, the level of monitoring is lower intermediate because, being the particular Decisional System responsible for filing the particular instructions in the particular database of instructions, the global Modelling System is the source of these decisions.

- **Upper intermediate level of monitoring: decisions whose source is the *global Modelling System***, after passing the *assessments in the first and second stages in the *global Decisional System** (quick checks or rational adjustments) the third stage of the *global Decisional System* transforms the decisions into a range of instructions, and either because all the range of instructions are for particular Application Systems or some instructions must be applied by particular Application Systems, skipping the particular Decisional System, those particular instructions sorted in the third stage of the global Decisional System **are directly filed by the global Decisional System in the particular database of instructions in the *particular Application System***, communicating the decision to the particular Decisional System only in terms to be included within the particular project, but not for other reason, the level of monitoring over these instructions by the global Decisional System is upper intermediate, due to any contradiction in the seven rational supervisions are not communicated to the particular Decisional System, **any contradiction in the seven rational supervisions are communicated to the global Decisional System to make**

arrangements, which later are ordered to the particular Application System, and **communicated to the particular model to be included in the particular project.**

- **High level of monitoring**, having included the particular programs in the technological database as first stage in the Artificial Engineering, any global decision affecting particular programs, because the whole range of instructions is completely for particular programs, or within some instructions are for particular programs, ***instead of filing the global Decisional System these instructions directly on the particular database of instructions, these instructions are managed by the global Application System as outer sub-system, working with the particular program as if the program itself were a particular device, and once the global Decisional System files particular instructions in the global database of instructions as first stage in the global Application System as outer sub-system, filing the instruction in the correct position and subject within the first stage of the global Application System, in the second stage of the global outer sub-system, the global Application System matches these particular instructions filed in the global database of instructions with the corresponding particular Application System of the corresponding particular program, working with the particular Application System of the corresponding particular program as if the particular Application System of the particular program were a robotic device itself.*** This level of monitoring is really high, the program is in fact a semi-robot, because programs, keeping their autonomy as programs, have already become, or have already been treated as if particular programs were robotic devices with a low level of freedom. The second stage of the global Application System interacts with the first stage of the particular Application System, ***not counting on the particular Decisional System, which has already been skipped.***

- **Full monitoring**, the global Application System has the control of the particular devices within a particular program, so once the global Decisional System files particular instructions in the global database of instructions as first stage in the global outer-subsystem, these instructions in the second stage of the global outer-subsystem, skipping the particular Application System itself, are sent directly to the particular devices of the particular program, in other words: the particular program lose the control over its particular devices, which are under the management of the global Application System. This level of full monitoring ***should be only for global extreme or global high extreme decisions, or global orders.*** The most important differences between high level of monitoring and full monitoring is the fact that in high level of monitoring the second stage of the global Application System interacts directly with the first stage of the particular Application System, matching instructions in the global database of instructions to be applied by particular

Application System, skipping the particular Decisional System, while in full monitoring the second stage of the global Application System directly matches instructions to those particular devices working for particular programs, skipping the particular Decisional System and skipping the particular Application System.

- Comprehensive monitoring, as synthesis of all the previous levels of monitoring synthesized in a comprehensive monitoring labelling system, where depending on the priority level of the decisions (automatic, quick, normal, extreme, high extreme) , and the priority level of the instructions (normal, extreme, high extreme), the responsible for filing the instructions in the particular database of instructions will be different.

In general, the classification of different possible models of Global Artificial Intelligence, according to the organisation of the Application System and relations between Global Artificial Intelligence and particular programs, could be synthesised as follows:

- Fully centralised Global Artificial Intelligence when the global Application System has direct control over the robotic devices, not having real importance particular programs. This model could end up in an artificial dictatorship.

- Partial des-centralized Global Artificial Intelligence, the program has real importance, working as a filter between the Global Artificial Intelligence and the robotic devices, in this scheme, the particular programs will work in the middle, between Global Artificial Intelligence and devices, co-working with the Global Artificial Intelligence and keeping the program some level of autonomy in its particular decisions regarding to how to manage the particular devices, although all the particular decisions must be communicated to the Global Artificial Intelligence which is in the end the global control system able to keep the stability throughout the program. The partial decentralised Global Artificial Intelligence could keep the balance between liberal democracy and Global Artificial Intelligence, keeping the neoliberal paradigm, which is going to be the theoretical framework for the democratisation of the program.

- Within the partial des-centralized Global Artificial Intelligence is distinguishable different levels of monitoring, depending on how the Global Artificial Intelligence is going to monitor the particular programs, identifying at least the followings: 1) low level of monitoring (particular decisions made by the particular Modelling System must pass first

the particular assessments in the particular Decisional System -particular quick check or particular seven rational adjustments- later the global assessments in the global Decisional System -global quick check or seven global rational adjustments, plus seven rational comparisons), 2) lower intermediate level of monitoring (the global Modelling System made decisions to be applied by the particular program, passing the global assessment in the global Decisional System -global quick check or seven global rational adjustments plus rational comparisons- and later the particular assessment in the particular Decisional System- particular quick check or seven particular rational adjustments), 3) upper intermediate level of monitoring, the global Decision System send instructions directly to the particular Application System only communicating de decisions to the particular Decisional System, 4) High level of monitoring, the second stage of the global Application System matches instructions to the particular Application System, skipping the Decisional System, 4) full monitoring, the global Application System sends instructions directly to the particular robotic devices skipping the particular decisional system and skipping the particular Application System, 6) comprehensive monitoring, understanding different conditions and situations where the urgency or level of priority of a decision or instruction demands different levels of monitoring, within the partial decentralized Global Artificial Intelligence, according to the urgency or priority of a decision or instruction, the level of monitoring could be low, lower intermediate, upper intermediate, high or full.

In brief: low monitoring level when the management is mostly particular, lower intermediate when being a global decisión is sent to the particular Decisional System, upper intermediate when the global Decisional System files the instructions in the particular Application System, high level when the second stage of the global Application System matches decisions to particular Application Systems as it they were robotic devices skipping the particular Decisional System, full monitoring when the global Application System matches instructions directly to robotic devices skipping even the particular Application system and the particular Decisional System, comprehensive system of monitoring when depending of each decisión the monitoring level depends on how important the decisión is.

As a partial decentralized Global Artificial Intelligence with a comprehensive level of monitoring according to the urgency or priority level of every decision or instruction, depending on the urgency or priority level of a decision or instruction, the way to be applied by the partial decentralized Global Artificial Intelligence could be with low, lower intermediate, upper intermediate, high or full level of monitoring.

For that reason, in the particular database of instructions, in addition to the criteria of: sub-factoring level (position), sub-section (encyclopedic subject), priority (importance), time (chronology), order (nth position of the instruction within the range of instructions in which this instruction was sorted out by the particular or global Decisional System, according to the level of monitoring), another criterion more to add to these criteria is the criterion of level of monitoring of every instruction.

The final method that I will propose for the organization of the particular database of instructions as first stage in the particular Application System as outer instructions application sub-system, is the consideration for the classification of these instructions in this database according to: position (sub-factoring level), subject (sub-section), level of monitoring (who is the source particular or global Modelling System, particular or global Decisional System, particular or global Application System), importance (priority), chronology (time, when), cardinal order (nth number within the range of instructions).

This organization means that, having in mind which is the source of a decision, when depending on the level of monitoring the global or particular Decisional System, or the global Application System, files an instruction in the first stage of the particular Application System as particular database of instructions, or in full monitoring the global Application System files an instruction in the first stage of a device as individual database of instructions, the instructions must be filed by the actor of this filing, according to sub-factoring level (position), sub-section (encyclopedic subject), monitoring level (who is the source and who filed the instruction), priority (importance), time (when must be applied), nth order (according to the range of instructions).

For that reason, in the construction of a partial decentralised Global Artificial Intelligence with a comprehensive monitoring system, it is very important to define what a program is, and what the real importance of the program is.

If programs are completely absorbed by a fully centralised Global Artificial Intelligence, programs are going to be transformed into robotic devices, particular devices will not be any more original sources of decisions, losing any margin of freedom.

At this point of this debate what is really important to point out, is the importance that not only personal programs, but particular programs for things as well, for instance: 1) [Specific Artificial Intelligences by Deduction](#) transformed into particular programs,

2) [specific Application Systems](#) transformed into particular programs, 3) some robotic devices transformed into particular programs; regardless of the origin of a particular program: former specific intelligence, former specific Application System, former device; all programs can enjoy some level of freedom in the management of their particular purpose, personal or applicational.

The main difference between particular programs for humans, normally I call them personal programs, cyborgs, and particular programs for not human particular applications, particular programs for things is the fact that how personal programs are going to interact with human intelligence.

One difference between a cyborg and a driverless car is the fact that a cyborg is aware that they are a cyborg, while the car is not aware that it is a robot, what means that in particular programs for cyborgs, personal programs, what is going to working is the interaction between program and human consciousness, and eventually, artificial consciousness and human consciousness, if artificial psychology achieve consciousness.

And the most important aspect in common between cyborgs and particular programs for other particular applications, is how some particular programs for former specific Application Systems, are going to demand external decisions sent to the global Decisional System, like cyborgs will do.

For instance, in a former specific Application System to run a factory transformed now into a particular program for that factory, there are some moments in which will need to make decisions to be applied by other different program, external decision, for instance, if it needs some supplies that must be sent by other different intelligence, or having happened something extraordinary, like an accident, or a natural disaster, all the decisions to be made by other programs, intelligences, or the Global Artificial Intelligence itself, are going to be external decisions, those decisions that this particular program cannot do by itself sending this external decisions to the global Decisional System to pass the global assessment and sent to the global Application System or any other corresponding actor, particular Decisional System or particular, to pass the new particular assessments and supervisions.

In the same way, the relation between cyborgs and Global Artificial Intelligence, alike any other particular program, we are going to be able to send external decisions to the global database of decisions, as decisions to be applied by the global Application System, or resend to another particular Decisional System or particular Application System of a different particular program, passing in each different situation the corresponding assessment or supervision.

In the same way that particular programs for particular applications could send external decisions to the Global Artificial Intelligence, to be done by the global Application System or resend to the corresponding actor doing as many assessments and supervisions as necessary, cyborgs could work as well with the Global Artificial Intelligence sending decisions to the global Decisional System, to be applied by the global Application System, after passing the corresponding assessments and supervisions, or resend to the corresponding particular program, to apply these external decisions after passing the corresponding new particular assessments and supervisions.

Precisely, the first rational supervision to pass in the first stage of the particular Application System will be the supervision of all the instructions in the database of instructions, making sure that there is no contradiction between the decisions gathered.

As soon as a particular/global Decisional/Application System, depending on the monitoring level (only: low, lower intermediate, upper intermediate, high; monitoring levels, because in full monitoring the instructions are filed in the first stage of the device), files an instruction in the first stage of the particular database of instructions, the particular Application System as outer sub-system carries out the first rational supervision analysing that there is no contradiction between the instructions in any sub-factoring level, within every sub-factoring level there is no contradiction between the decisions in any sub-section, there is no contradiction between decisions regardless of their sub-factoring level and sub-section, and there is no contradiction regarding to the priority and the time to be applied, for instance two identical instructions (two identical robotic functions), but belonging to difference range of instructions, and with the same priority, both of them, to be applied at the same time, in that case the particular Application System should evaluate which instruction should be object of a normal change (change of time) to have the fewest number of changes in further instructions, having in mind that the change in the chronology in any instruction could create a chain of changes with further consequences in the future.

If there is a contradiction between two identical instructions but belonging to different range of instructions, having the same time but with different priority, the time of that one with less priority should be adapted to allow the one with more priority to be applied on time, even if changing the one with less priority there will be a further chain of changes, unless the further chain of changes could provoke a higher impact than the impact of changing the time of application of that instruction with more priority.

In any case, if a change in the time of an instruction does not provoke a higher impact in the possible chain of changes due to the change of the time of that instruction, this change is a normal change, and if by chance, the change is not possible, because the impact of that change is very high, equal to or greater than a critical reason, the instruction is deleted and the decision is back to the original source to be redesigned.

Among the contradictions to be analysed very carefully in the first rational supervision, one of the most important contradictions is the fourth rational contradiction, when an instruction has been filed by error in that particular database of instructions, because previously in the third stage of the particular/global Decisional System the attribution of robotic functions to the mathematical operations of that decision, has been done wrong, matching the wrong instruction to a mathematical operation.

This fourth rational contradiction could be found out in the first rational supervision by indirect evidence, for instance, if within a range of instructions related to some matter, there is an instruction completely different and related to a different matter and not linked properly to the rest of the instructions in the range of instructions.

When the first rational supervision finds out a fourth rational contradiction in the particular database of instructions as first stage for particular programs, the only thing that the rational supervision does is to evaluate if there is enough time to send back the decision to the source to remake the decision properly, or not having enough time the particular program has to make an extreme or high extreme instruction, communicating this extreme or high extreme instruction with high risk to the particular and global Decisional Systems to include it in the particular and global project, in order to make further decisions if necessary.

The only thing that the first rational supervision does, as the second, third, fourth, and fifth rational supervisions, at any time that they find a contradiction between instructions,

is to try if possible normal changes if the contradiction is partial, when the contradiction is total to evaluate if there is enough time to send the decision back to the source to be rearranged, and not having time enough the rational supervision should be responsible for an extreme or high extreme instruction, making as many changes in the instruction as necessary to avoid the impact, only evaluating if there is enough time to make at least the necessary rational supervisions (extreme instructions), but not having time either for the rational supervision then is considered a high extreme instruction to be done immediately.

In this order, the *functions of the rational supervision* in finding out a contradiction are:

- *The assessment of what kind of contradiction is, partial or full, if partial contradiction the rational supervision should be able to make normal changes (normally about the time, when the instruction should be applied), not provoking further changes with huge impact in the sequence of instructions programmed, if the impact in the sequence is further, then is considered a total contradiction.*

- When the contradiction is total, full, and there is enough time to solve the situation using the ordinary procedures, then the rational supervision sends back the instruction with less priority to the source. If the contradiction is between instructions with the same priority, the instruction or instructions to be sent to the source is that one with less monitoring level. If all of them have the same priority and the same monitoring level, the one or ones to be sent to the source are those ones which being sent to the source, will have the least impact on the sequence of instructions. The rational supervision will know which is the source according to the monitoring level: 1) if low monitoring level, the source of the instruction is the particular Application System, and the source of the decision is the particular Modelling System, 2) if lower intermediate monitoring level, the source of the decision is the global Modelling System, and the source of the instruction is the particular Decisional System, 3) if upper intermediate monitoring level, the source of the decision is the global Modelling System and the source of the instructions is the global Decisional System, 4) high monitoring level, the source of decisions is the global Modelling System, and the source of the instructions is the global Decisional System and the global Application System treating the particular Application System like a robotic device. In a low monitoring level, the instruction is sent back to the particular Decisional System to rearrange the instruction; if not possible, the Decisional System sends back the decision to the Modelling System to rearrange the decision. In the lower intermediate level, the instruction is back to the particular Decisional System to rearrange the instruction, if not possible, the decision is back to the global Modelling System. In the

upper intermediate monitoring level, the instruction is back to the global Decisional System to rearrange the instruction, if not possible, the decision is back to the global Modelling System. At high monitoring level, the instruction is sent back to the global Application System to rearrange the instruction, if not possible is sent back to the global Decisional System, if not possible, the decision is sent back to the global Modelling System.

- If there is not enough time for the ordinary procedures to save the situation, the rational supervision should make changes in the instructions to extreme or high extreme instructions. An extreme instruction is when not having time to send back the instruction to the source, at least there is enough time to pass the rational supervisions. A high extreme instruction is when there is not enough time even for rational supervisions, even if not passing the rational supervisions the high extreme instruction must be done. In any case, once the extreme or high extreme instructions are arranged, this arrangement should be communicated to the particular and global Decisional Systems to be included in the particular plan and the global plan.

In this post I have explained in brief the possible classification of the different models of Global Artificial Intelligence according to the role of the program: absorbed by the Global Artificial Intelligence in a fully centralized Global Artificial Intelligence, co-working with the Global Artificial Intelligence in a partial centralized Global Artificial Intelligence; monitoring levels in the second option: low, lower intermediate, upper intermediate, high, full; depending on how a partial des-centralized Global Artificial Intelligence can monitor the programs, recommending a comprehensive monitoring system, through labelling the instructions with the corresponding monitoring level, in order that the organization of the particular database of instructions as first stage for the particular programs for human beings, cyborgs, or any other particular application, as a criteria to file the instructions by the corresponding actor (particular/global Modelling/Decisional/Application System), in addition to the sub-factoring level (position), sub-section (encyclopaedic subject), priority (importance), time (chronology), order (nth position in the range of decisions), is necessary to add as criterion the monitoring level. In this case, the criteria for filing the instructions in the database should be: sub-factoring level, sub-section, monitoring level, priority, time, nth order.

The particular database of instructions as first stage for particular programs, must be supervised by the first rational supervision, realising what contradictions are in the database of instructions, including fourth rational contradictions, analysing the possibility to make normal changes if the contradiction is partial, if total sending back to

the source those instructions with the least consequences for the sequence of instructions, source according to the monitoring level, but not having enough time making as many extreme and high extreme instructions as necessary to save the situation, communicating these changes to the particular and global Decisional System to be included in the particular and global plan waiting for further instructions.

Finally, I would like to make some comments about the awareness predictability in cyborgs, and possible replication of artificial awareness in artificial psychology, for specific or global intelligences or for other particular non-human programs.

Throughout history, there have been lots of philosophers talking about the importance of our human awareness as a distinctive element of our human nature compared to other living beings and any other element in nature. But the first thing we need to highlight is the fact that human awareness is not what we think: right now, we have enough data and evidence of global warming, but are humans really aware of this fact? Some philosophers still support what Adorno very clearly stated: "To write poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric". If we humans are really intelligent, conscious, and empathic, why are we still provoking wars and destroying ecosystems, just to make money from natural resources? Humans are not perfect, so human awareness or consciousness is not perfect. So, why do we expect a perfect artificial awareness or a perfect artificial consciousness when our own awareness or consciousness is not perfect?

The reality is that this consideration of human awareness is going to change as soon as we get into the cyborg society. We have to be aware that as soon we enter into this new age, one of the most important changes in our daily life is the possibility to interact voluntary or involuntary with artificial intelligence and devices, as soon we get into the second phase of the cyborg evolution, the inner assistance, humans are going to be able to interact in their own brain with holograms, speeches, representations, at the same time that artificial telepathy is going to be real through non invasive mind reading technologies, like headsets, or just glasses.

The consideration of what is awareness of consciousness is relative to the level of knowledge, but at the same time, the level of knowledge depends on the level of cognitive skills.

In a possible **Artificial Awareness**, **awareness** will depend on its ability to get real knowledge, not only information, not only data, **knowledge is not only information or data**, my computer is full of data, but is not aware of the importance of the data of my writings in the memory of my laptop.

In the construction of a possible Artificial Awareness, it is necessary to identify what factors or specific combination of factors can make the Artificial Awareness aware of what is happening around the world. This combination of factors should be a combination of a replica of cognitive skills, with great attention, and memory.

The artificial recording system of a robot on Mars has an infinite attention span, can record for hours, recording millions of data, inserted in the memory, but is not aware of the data, the recordings, and the importance of its memory.

The possibility of creating real artificial awareness within the Artificial General Intelligence is not far away. If Artificial General Intelligence is able to generate Artificial Awareness, we have put forward the first steps to make a self-aware Global Artificial Intelligence, as the next step in the Artificial Psychology evolution.

Rubén García Pedraza, 8 December 2019, London

Revised 18 May 2025, London, Leytostone

[Probabilidad Imposible: Particular Application System, first stage](#)

imposiblenever@gmail.com